

NASSAU COUNTY OFFICE OF EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT
 100 CARMAN AVENUE
 EAST MEADOW, NY 11554
 Phone 516 573 0636 Fax 516 573 0673
 ncoem@nassaucountyny.gov

THOMAS R. SUOZZI
 COUNTY EXECUTIVE



RICHARD A. ROTANZ
 COMMISSIONER

Nassau County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Planning Project
Nassau County Hazard Mitigation Planning Group Meeting #3
- WORKING SESSION -
June 6, 2006
NC-OEM Offices, 100 Carman Avenue, East Meadow, NY
10:00 am to 12:00 pm

MINUTES

Attending:

Name	Affiliation	Address	Phone	Fax	E-mail
Kevin Mulligan	Nassau County	1194 Prospect Avenue Westbury, NY	516-571-9611	516-571-9657	kmulligan@nassaucountyny.gov
Andrew Ward	Seaford UFSD	1600 Washington Ave. Seaford, NY	516-592-4017	516-592-4048	andrew.ward@mail.seaford.k12.ny.us
Kevin Greene	Floral Park Village	1 Floral Blvd. Floral Park, NY	516-326-6300		kjq223@verizon.net
Steven Cherson	Atlantic Beach	65 The Plaza Atlantic Beach, NY	516-371-4600	516-371-4631	plaza65@aol.com
Richard R. Sullivan	Valley Stream	123 S. Central Ave. Valley Stream, NY	516-592-5143	516-825-6038	
John Baroni	East Rockaway	476 Atlantic Ave. East Rockaway, NY	516-690-1229	516-887-6311	midegate@aol.com
Dennis Weiner	Centre Island	100 Centre Island Rd. Oyster Bay, NY	516-351-3589 516-922-6466	516-922-6467	weiner876@optonline.net
Joseph Diaz	Great Neck Plaza	2 Gussack Plaza Great Neck, NY	516-482-4500	516-482-3503	mayorjean@greatneckplaza.net
Peggy Caltabiano	Massapequa Pk.	151 Front St. Massapequa Pk., NY	516-798-0244	516-798-6106	villadmin@masspk.com

John LaMarca	Massapequa Pk.	151 Front St. Massapequa Pk., NY	516-798-0244	516-798-6106	dpw@masspk.com
David Paterson	Plandome Heights	67 Borndale Rd. Manhasset, NY	516-869-3163	516-869-0066	dlpaterson@hotmail.com
Terry Winters	Nassau County	100 Carman Ave. East Meadow, NY	516-573-0636		twinters@nassaucountyny.gov
Ted Blach	Westubry	235 Lincoln Pl. Westbury, NY	516-334-0062	516-333-4662	tblach@spec.net
David DeRienzis	Roslyn Harbor	500 Motts Cove Rd. Roslyn, NY	516-261-0368	516-261-1803	DeRienzisG@msn.com
Wade Curry	Roslyn Harbor	1200 Old Northern Blvd. Roslyn, NY	516-621-1961	516-621-2171	roslynbuild@optonline.net
Bill Babcock	Merrick FD	P.O. Box 235 Merrick, NY 11566	516-223-1501	516-223-1502	bi17sm@aol.com
Matt Arnold	NYS DOT	250 Vets. Memorial Highway Hauppauge, NY	631-952-6673		marnold@dot.state.ny.us
David Kincaid	Great Neck UFSD	345 Lakeville Rd. Great Neck, NY	516-773-1465	516-773-6685	dkincaid@greatneck.k12.ny.us
Dominick Cappelletti	Great Neck UFSD	346 Lakeville Rd. Great Neck, NY	516-773-1460	516-773-1455	dcappelletti@greatneck.k12.ny.us
Larry Bien	Lyhndvdeook	1 Columbus Dr. Lynbrook, NY	516-599-8838	516-886-8148	l.bien@lynbrookvillage.com
Ron Ciesinski	Mineola	155 Washington Ave. Mineola, NY	516-746-0753	516-746-0611	dpw@mineola-ny.gov
Tom Rini	Mineola	P.O. Box 1874 155 Washington Ave. Mineola, NY	516-746-0753	516-746-0611	dpw@mineola-ny.gov
Donna Plante	Town of Hempstead	285 Denton Ave. New Hyde Park, NY	516-739-6719	516-739-6717	planted@northhempstead.com
Jon Klein	Town of Oyster Bay	54 Audrey Ave. Oyster Bay, NY	516-624-6180	516-624-6139	jklein@oysterbay-ny.gov
Judy Fischer	Omni Consulting	P.O. Box 496 Port Jefferson, NY	631-473-4826		jefischer@aol.com
Shubha Shrivastava	URS	200 Orchard Ridge Dr. Gaithersburg, MD	301-670-3306		shubha_shrivastava@urscorp.com
Anna Foley	URS	201 Willowbrook Blvd. Wayne, NJ	973-785-0700 ext. 449	973-812-0985	anna_foley@urscorp.com
Maryanne Greene	Stewart Manor OEM	242 Elton Rd. Stewart Manor, NY	516-437-0797		magreene2003@verizon.net

Thomas J. Mylod	Bellerose	10 Massachusetts Blvd. Bellerose Village, NY	516-328-1219		mylodt@optonline.net
Marc Silbert	Sands Point	26 Tibbits Lane Sands Point, NY	516-883-3044		marcsilb@mac.com
L. T. Paretta	Town of Hempstead	200 No. Franklin St. Hempstead, NY	516-538-4900	516-485-4547	lparetta@hotmail.org
Eugene Brown	Long Beach Police	1 West Chester St. Long Beach NY	516-431-1800	516-431-1459	ltbrown101@aol.com
Steven Polcer	NC DPW	1194 Prospect Avenue Westbury, NY	516-471-9607	516-571-9657	spolcer@nassaucountyny.gov
Gary Kornova	Hempstead Village	99 Nichols Ct. Hempstead, NY	489-3400		
George Sandas	Hempstead Village	100 Nichols Ct. Hempstead, NY	516-478-6246	516-489-3015	scscaa75@aol.com
Andy Silverman	East Hills	209 Harbor Hill Rd.	516-621-5600	516-625-8736	asilverman@villageofeasthills.org

The Nassau County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Planning Group met June 6, 2006 from 10 a.m. to 12 p.m. at the Nassau County Office of Emergency Management for a working session to identify, evaluate, and prioritize goals, objectives, and hazard mitigation actions (mitigation strategy) for each participating jurisdiction.

The working session began with Mr. Terry Winters, Nassau County Office of Emergency Management, giving a brief introduction about the purpose of the meeting.

Next, Ms. Anna Foley, of URS Corp., invited questions regarding the Interim Deliverables that had been emailed to all Planning Group members on May 30, 2006 (there were no questions).

The remainder of the working session was structured into two main parts: Risks and Mitigation Actions.

I. Risks: The first part of the working session was dedicated to highlighting key risks.

- Summary of Jurisdictional Vulnerability to Hazards. Ms. Foley presented a table summary of jurisdictional vulnerability to hazards. For each jurisdiction, hazards were presented in terms of their likelihood of future occurrence (infrequent or regular) and the likely damages (little damage potential, moderate damage potential, and high damage potential). The table was intended to summarize for easy reference on one sheet the information that was in last week's Interim Deliverables.
- Each participant was asked to highlight the row for their jurisdiction on the list and keep the page handy for the remainder of the working session. Many communities have high percentages of their improved property and/or population in hazard areas. Many utility locations, emergency facilities, and historic and

cultural resources are in hazard areas and could be good candidates for hazard mitigation projects.

One focus of the discussion was on hurricane shelters. Terry Winters indicated that the Red Cross had identified shelters, and has them in a 'queue' of sorts for additional study to determine if each location is designed to withstand hurricane-force winds. A possible mitigation action would be to determine the design level and pursue mitigation activities (or new shelter locations) as applicable.

- Assets in Hazard Areas. Ms. Foley next walked the Group through the *Interim Deliverable: Identification and Characterization of Assets*. Five key types of assets were considered (Improved Property, Emergency Facilities, Utilities, Historic and Cultural Resources, and Population) in relation to each of the identified hazards.

Again, each participant was asked to highlight in the tables the row for their jurisdiction and keep the pages handy for the remainder of the working session. Terry Winters reminded Planning Group members that the list of emergency facilities and utilities is security sensitive information and is for internal planning use only (not for release to the public or other stakeholders).

- 1993 Hurricane Evacuation Study Table 3-3: Institutions/Medical Facilities Surge Analysis. As part of the USACE 1993 Hurricane Evacuation Study, tables were generated by community highlighting institutional/medical facilities subject to storm surge. For each facility, the first floor elevation was listed along with Category 1-4 surge heights, noting which category storms could potentially inundate the first floors of these listed facilities.

Each participant was asked to see if their community had any facilities listed on the table and if so, to highlight the listed facilities and note which if any could incur first floor flooding during a hurricane - particularly for lower category (more likely) storms - and keep the pages handy for the remainder of the working session as these facilities would be good candidates for mitigation projects.

- NYSDOT Drainage Problem Areas in Nassau County. Planning Group member Matt Arnold from NYSDOT presented a summary of drainage problem areas along state route's in Nassau County. Data was presented in tabular and map form. Ms. Foley explained how URS had highlighted any identified problem areas that were also along evacuation routes.

Out of 18 total locations, 10 were along evacuation routes. Of the 10, three were along the north shore and 7 that were along the south shore. The seven south shore locations were highlighted in orange and were a higher priority because they are along evacuation routes where population density is highest and the greatest number of people could be evacuating. The three sites along the north shore were given a lower priority and were highlighted in yellow. Mr. Arnold discussed NYSDOT's plans for mitigating flooding in these locations and the role that a local jurisdiction could play in the process.

II. Mitigation Actions: The second part of the working session was dedicated to evaluating and prioritizing hazard mitigation actions to address identified risks and to developing a hazard mitigation strategy for implementing the selected actions.

:

- What is the role of a local jurisdiction in mitigation? Ms. Foley discussed how a local government's role may differ for mitigation of a privately-owned facility (such as a hospital) versus its role for mitigation of a publicly-owned facility (such as a police station) and how the jurisdiction's "mitigation action" would be different in the two cases.

- Goals and General Types of Actions. Ms. Shubha Shrivastava, also of URS, presented an overview to the group of the *Interim Deliverable: Range of Alternative Mitigation Actions Considered* and invited questions. Working draft goals that were included in the interim deliverable were voted upon and accepted by each participating jurisdiction without modifications. The range of potential types of mitigation actions presented in the interim deliverable was discussed, and Planning Group members were given several minutes to review the data in light of their jurisdictions risks.
- Specific Problem Statements Identified By Planning Group Members. One of the meeting handouts was a table summary of past discussion points regarding problem areas and possible mitigation solutions. These points had been raised by various members of the Planning Group through the course of the plan development process, and were summarized here for group members as a reminder of ideas they had in the past, for use in their evaluation of mitigation actions at the meeting. Group members were given several minutes to review the table, in light of their jurisdictions risks.
- Jurisdictional Selection of Action Items. Planning Group members were given several minutes to review all of the information and were asked to identify (highlight) at least one mitigation action for their jurisdiction. URS recommended choosing several actions – but limiting to a manageable number of actions that they feel their community can really commit to working toward.
- Action Item Prioritization. Next, URS led Planning Group members through a process of evaluating and prioritizing their selected mitigation actions with a focus on the benefits and costs of each action using the “STAPLEE” criteria. Planning Group members were given several minutes to accomplish this. Forms were used for each jurisdiction to document their analysis and prioritization.
- Implementation Strategy. Finally, URS led the Planning Group members through a process of identifying an implementation strategy for their mitigation actions, including: the hazard that the action is intended to address, whether the action applies to existing and/or new community assets, the primary agency or department responsible for moving forward with the action’s implementation, existing local planning mechanisms through which the action will be implemented, a target date for the action item’s completion, estimated project costs, and possible funding sources. Again, several minutes were allotted for this activity.

Wrap Up

- At the conclusion of the meeting, URS collected Prioritization Worksheets and Implementation Strategy Sheets from each jurisdiction.
- URS reminded Planning Group members that in order for URS to complete the draft by June 9th, feedback must be provided before the end of the day to be included.
- URS discussed with NCOEM possible cover graphics for the draft plan.

Questions/Discussion Throughout

- Q1** Regarding the ‘Summary of Jurisdictional Vulnerability to Hazards’ – what is the basis for damage potential?
- A1** (Anna) The assessed value of improved property in the hazard area as compared to the total assessed value of improved property in the jurisdiction.

- A1** (Shubha) It is the amount of things exposed and not loss of life.
- Q2** (Plandome Heights) Wind damage is severe because of low trees.
- A2** (Shubha) Tree trimming programs might be one hazard mitigation action that you could consider.
- Q3** (Tom Mylod, Bellerose) Request for clarification for 'value' of improved property. Is this the market value?
- A3** (Anna) No this is not the market value. URS received data from the County in GIS form for each parcel in the County. The data included, for each parcel, the assessed value of land only and the total assessed value (where total = land plus improvements). Coordination with the County indicated that the assessed value of improvements is equal to the total assessed value minus the assessed value of the land. The tables in the interim deliverable present this resulting assessed value of improvements, and then the percentage located in each hazard area. A reminder that for earthquakes and wind hazards which are equal county-wide, 100% of the improvements are in the hazard area.
- Q4** (Tom) The assessed value is a lot less than the sale value.
- A4** (Anna) Yes, that's true. The market value (sale value) would be much higher. The County has update factors which could be used on a parcel-by-parcel basis to update assessed values to market values based upon four general types of buildings. We did not do this here. If one were to apply an update factor to get to market from assessed, the percentages would still be the same.
- Q5** Does assessed value include government buildings?
- A5** (Anna) Yes, it is the value of all improved property in the county.
- Q6** (Tom) The tables in the interim deliverable have more than just incorporated cities/towns/villages.
- A6** (Anna) Yes, the analysis conducted in terms of assets in hazard areas incorporated both incorporated and unincorporated areas, for participating and non-participating jurisdictions. We did this because we had been provided with enough data to go to this level of detail, and so decided to use it. Particularly good for future updates of the plan if new jurisdictions decide to participate – their data is already in here.
- Q7** When you look at total assessed value is it within the jurisdiction?
- A7** (Anna) "total assessed value of improvements" in the table is community-wide total. Then, the percentages show what portion of that total falls within the particular identified hazard areas.
- Q8** (Jon) Are you looking at the entire Town of Oyster Bay or special flood areas?
- A8** (Anna) Again, the total shows jurisdiction-wide total, and the percentages would then indicate how much of the total would fall in, say, the 100-year floodplain and each of the four different category surge areas. It's showing how much of the improved property in a jurisdiction falls within the footprint of each of the different hazard areas for which that community is exposed.
- Q9** If there is a hazard we think you should include, should we address it now?
- A9** (Anna) If you did not bring this to our attention in the past by submitted it as a comment, through the Hazard ID Questionnaire which everyone was asked to complete, it will have

to be incorporated it later (during future updates of the plan). We are getting the material out to SEMO by the end of this week so the county does not jeopardize its grant.

Q10 (Long Beach) Only 83 per cent of the barrier island affected by flooding?

A10 (Anna) It is not the land area but the value of the improved property. It shows that 83 per cent of Long Beach is in the FEMA Q3 mapped 100-year floodplain. Note that the Q3 data shows some areas in the 500-year floodplain.

Q11 (Centre Island) Centre Island police stations not on list?

A11 (Terry) Should be.

A11 (Anna) The source of the Emergency Facilities data in the Asset Identification and Characterization Interim Deliverable came from HAZUS. If you see something that is not listed, this should be included in future updates of the plan. The data is current to the year 2000, so it is likely that you will find things that are not included. This is true for other asset data that was taken from HAZUS (population and utilities). And for the historic and cultural resources data, that is only State and Federally listed sites, as per GIS data we received from SHPO earlier this year.

Q12 (Centre Island) Centre Island water services?

A12 Again, the utilities shown are pulled from HAZUS because it was the best readily available data at this time. As an action item for future updates of the plan, it would be good particularly since several people are commenting on unlisted facilities, that participating jurisdictions work to update these lists. The best way to do that is to, during future updates, be sure to identify the name, address and also the latitude and longitude of the facility (lat/lon for the facility is plotted in GIS over the hazard areas to see if a site is 'in' or 'out'; address-matching is not nearly as accurate).

Q13 (Roslyn) Roslyn has many landmark houses. Our list is twice that of the state list.

A13 This is a state list – a starting point for the plan development process as it is the best readily available data. Local jurisdictions may have sites of their own that are not recognized at the state or federal levels. For future action items, you could always add sites that are not on state/federal lists. But keep in mind: local jurisdictions probably have limited resources and unless your community would be identifying hazard mitigation actions for historic and cultural resources, those limited resources may be better spent improving data for, say, emergency facilities or utilities – sites that you may choose to prioritize higher for implementing mitigation actions. That is the choice, though, for every jurisdiction to make.

Q14 The Sands Point Preserve is in our village but it is a county facility. How about mitigation actions there? What is the village's role or 'action'?

A14 (Anna) An action item might be to meet with Nassau County to let them know that it is a priority for you, and maybe talk about how the County and Village can work together to complete a mitigation project.

Q15 Can doing a study be an action item?

A15 (Anna) Yes. There are probably many things that you may only want to undertake as action items after more detailed studies are completed. So yes, they are good action items for the plan. Keep in mind though that many grant programs at FEMA do not consider studies alone as eligible types of projects.

Q16 Do they fund engineering design?

- A16** (Shubha) You have to submit a benefit-cost analysis that shows that design can be justified. Most grant programs at FEMA allow applications to be submitted with only very preliminary designs.
- Q17** (Plandome Heights) How do we ID actions when approaching businesses?
- A17** (Anna) One idea for the jurisdiction's action might be to meet with businesses and let them know that the jurisdiction has adopted the plan and that if a particular business is interested in pursuing a mitigation project that they would like to apply for funding for, that the jurisdiction could act as an eligible sub-applicant for the grant application, acting on behalf of the business. This is the same type of approach that one would take for, say, a private homeowner who is interested in an elevation or acquisition project to protect against flooding.